



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/465,879	12/16/1999	JOHN L. BEEZER	3797.84611	9430
28319	7590 11/24/2003		EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,			TRAN, MYLINH T	
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT 1001 G STREET , N.W. ELEVENTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	18
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20001-4597		DATE MAILED: 11/24/2003	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				$-\alpha$
•1	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	8
Office Action Summary		09/465,879	JOHN L. BEEZER	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Mylinh T Tran	2174	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NC - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply objected for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vertor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communicatio D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	n.
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amer	ndment filed 10/20/03.		
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) This	action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	nce except for formal matters, pro Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	osecution as to the merits is 53 O.G. 213.	3
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1,3-9 and 11-28</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1,3-9 and 11-28</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	· ·	
	on Papers	olocion roquiromoni.		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	epted or b) objected to by the for drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d	d).
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.	
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents Incomplication from the International Bureau Cee the attached detailed Office action for a list of a claim for domestic cance a specific reference was included in the first Topic Certified Copies of the priorical Copies of the priorical Copies of the priorical Copies of the certified copies of the priorical Copies	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received in (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). of the certified copies not received c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(ext sentence of the specification or visional application has been received.	on No ed in this National Stage ed. e) (to a provisional applicati in an Application Data She eived. and/or 121 since a specific	eet.
Attachment				
2) 🔲 Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal Page	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 10/20/03 has been entered and carefully considered. However, arguments regarding rejections under 35.U.S.C 103 to claims 1 and 9 have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record and newly discovered prior art, therefore claims 1, 3-9, 11-28 are rejected under the new ground of rejection as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sachs et al. [US. 5,956,034] in view of "USING NETSCAPE 2"

As to claims 1 and 9, Sachs et al. discloses displaying at least a portion of the electronic document to the user as an immersive reading page, the immersive reading page mimicing a printed paper (figure 3A, (100), column 2, lines 50-60 and column 5, lines 41-52); associating with an element of the immersive reading page enhanced page functionality (column 5, lines 52-65, column 6, lines 1-13 and column 6, lines 41-52). Sachs et al. cites "Navigation of the reading materials is effected by different functions as represented by a plurality

Art Unit: 2174

of function display" read as the enhanced page functionality. Each icon in figure 3B, (120-138) represents one enhanced functionality; providing the user access to the enhanced functionality in response to the user selecting the element of the immersive reading page (column 5, lines 57-60, Sachs cites "Similarly, an icon representing the function of turning to the previous page enables the user to go back through the text"). The difference between Sachs et al. and the claim is "no visual indication of the enhanced functionality is provided prior to the user selecting the element of the immersive reading page". While Sachs shows the immersive reading page, "USING NETSCAPE 2" teaches "no visual indication" at page 550, figure 21.11. Both references show the elements of the enhanced functionality. However, while Sachs shows the enhanced functionality with visual indication, "USING NETSCAPE 2" provides the enhanced functionality without visual indication. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sachs et al. and Brown before them at the time the invention was made to modify the immersive reading page as taught by Sachs et al. to include the enhanced functionality with no visual indication of "USING NETSCAPE 2", with the motivation being to save space of a screen and provide menu only when user wants to see as taught by "USING" NETSCAPE 2".

As to claims 3 and 11, Sachs et al. also discloses the enhanced functionality is transparently associated with the element of the immersive reading page (figure 4A, (142), column 4, lines 50-55).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claims 4 and 12, Sachs et al. teaches the step of invoking a training mode for teaching the association to a user (figure 2B, (86a), column 4, lines 35-55). As to claims 5 and 13, Sachs et al. also teaches the element that is a page number and the step of associating comprises associating intrabook navigational functionality with the page number (column 5, lines 51-55 and column 8, lines 60-68).

As to claims 6 and 14, Sachs et al. shows the element is a title line and the step of associating comprises associating interbook navigational functionality with the title line (column 7, lines 37-44).

As to claims 7 and 15, Sachs et al. also shows the element is content and the step of associating comprises associating content interaction functionality with the content (column 7, lines 44-55).

As to claims 8 and 16, Sachs et al. demonstrates the step of associating comprises the step of associating a first category of enhanced functionality with a first category of element on the immersive reading page (column 5,lines 44-55).

As to claims 17 and 23, Sachs et al. also demonstrate the enhanced functionality includes highlighting (column 7, lines 1-18).

As to claims 19 and 28, Sachs et al. suggests the enhanced functionality includes drawing (column 2, lines 50-55).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claims 20 and 25, Sachs et al. also suggest the enhanced functionality includes adding a bookmark indicator in relation to the immersive reading page (column 5, line 65 through column 6, line 5).

As to claims 22 and 27, Sachs et al. discloses the electronic document is a book in electronic form and the immersive reading page mimics a printed paper page of a book (column 1, lines 47-58 and column 2, lines 62-68).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18, 21, 24 and 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sachs et al. [US. 5,956,034] in view of "USING NETSCAPE 2" and further in view of Sachs et al. [US. 6,493,734].

As to claims 18, 21, 24 and 26, the difference between Sachs [US. 5,956,034], "USING NETSCAPE 2" and the claim is the enhanced functionality includes annotating and a note to the immersive reading page. Sachs et al. [US. 6,493,734] shows the feature at column 3, lines 50-58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Sachs [US. 5,956,034], "USING NETSCAPE 2" and Sachs [US. 6,493,734] before them at the time the invention was made to modify the enhanced functionality taught by

Sachs et al. [US. 5,956,034] and "USING NETSCAPE 2" to include specific features functionality of Sachs [US. 6,493,734], with the motivation being to be able to provide additional advantageous features to the users as taught by Sachs [US. 6,493,734].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument with respect to claims 1, 3-9 and 11-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2174

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238, may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-4395 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to 6.30 PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the

confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174

SPD. LUU

PRIMARY EXAMINER